

Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 2, 6-16, 18-19, 23-26, and 29-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. No claims have been amended, added, cancelled, or withdrawn. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, 17, 21-22, and 27-28 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-5, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,542,055 issued to Amini et al. (*Amini*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-5, 17, and 20 are not anticipated by *Amini*.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (“MPEP”), in § 2131, states:

“A claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “**The identical invention** must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 869 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated **only if each and every element of the claim is found in the cited reference** and the cited reference must show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim.

Claim 1. recites:

1. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:
determining node ID information identifying a second node device of a multimode computer system. wherein a node device is a component of the multi-node computer system;

storing the node ID information identifying the second node device on a storage device located on a first node device of the multi-node computer system; and

retrieving, from a storage device of the second node device, node ID information identifying a third node device;

wherein the first node device is connected to the second node device, the third node device is connected to the second node device, and the second node device includes node ID information identifying the third node device.

(Emphasis added). Thus, claim 1 recites a node ID discovery process for a multi-node computer system. The term node, as used in the instant application, refers to any of the addressable and/or discoverable components within a computer system (e.g., a scalable node controller, an I/O hub controller, etc.). Independent claim 17 and 20 similarly recite "a multi-node computer system, wherein a node device is a component of the multi-node computer system."

The Office action directs the Applicant's attention to the detailed description of *Amini* and states that "Amini's creation of the map is the claimed storing node ID information." The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The detailed description of *Amini* is directed to a "PCI bus architecture...When the CPU runs the configuration software it must access and **read or write to the configuration space of each device or bridge** to configure the system and create the address map." (emphasis added). The terms "each device or bridge" as used in *Amini*, is understood to reference accessing the addressing information for each PCI device separately on each device. See, e.g., column 7, line 61-column 8, line 16. *Amini* does, not however, disclose "storing the node ID information identifying the second node device **on a storage device located on a first node device** of the multi-node computer system; and retrieving **from a storage device of the second node device**, the node ID information identifying a third node device." as

recited in claims 1, 17, and 20. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Amini* cannot anticipate independent claims 1, 17, and 20 for at least the reason that *Amini* does not disclose “storing the node ID information identifying the second node device on a storage device located on a first node device of the multi-node computer system; and retrieving from a storage device of the second node device, the node ID information identifying a third node device.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1; claims 17 and 20 were rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-5, 17, and 20 are not anticipated by *Amini*.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (“MPEP”), in § 706.02(j), states:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference** (or references when combined) **must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

(Emphasis added). Thus, the MPEP and applicable case law require that the Office action establish that a combination of references teach or suggest **all of the claim limitations** of rejected claims to sustain an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As shown below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Wang is cited as teaching a “a multi processor system... a CPU interface unit for supporting multiple CPUs...a flow control unit for control of the data flow between scalable nodes and bridges... [and] bridges for connecting peripheral devices/nodes...” Whether or not *Wang* discloses the limitations cited by the Office action, it does not teach or suggest “storing the node ID information identifying the second node device on a storage device located on a first node device of the multi-node computer system; and retrieving from a storage device of the second node device, the node ID information identifying a third node device.” as recited in claim 1. Because neither *Wang* nor *Amini* teach or suggest the above-cited claim limitations, no combination of *Wang* and *Amini* teaches or suggests the invention as recited in claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that independant claim 27 is not rendered obvious by *Wang* in view of *Amini*

Claims 21-22 depend from claim 20; claim 28 depends from claim 27. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims, 21-22, and 28 are not taught by *Amini* and is not rendered obvious by *Wang* in view of *Amini*; therefore the rejection under 103(a) is moot.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2006

/Brett C. Stoffel/

Brett C. Stoffel

Reg. No. 58,698

Agent for Intel Corporation

c/o

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor, & Zafman LLP

12400 Wilshire Boulevard

Seventh Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

(503) 264-1017 or (502) 439-8778